

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,527	07/25/2003	Raymond W. Howard	Lucky Line.1320	2915
34284 Rutan & Tucke	7590 02/08/200 r. LLP.	EXAMINER		
611 ANTON BLVD			GALL, LLOYD A	
SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA	, CA 92626		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3673	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/627,527	HOWARD, RAYMOND W.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lloyd A. Gall	3673
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap		rith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING E - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statul Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI .136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 I 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal mat	• •
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,5,9-11 and 14-20 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,6-8,12 and 13 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	is/are withdrawn from cons	sideration.
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2007 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ ob e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in A pority documents have beer au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No In received in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION

At the outset, applicant should mote that the drawings filed on March 30, 2007 are approved. The drawing corrections filed on November 13, 2007 are not approved, and are not necessary. The numeral 19 in the drawing correction of November 13, 2007 is inaccurate.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, line 2, it is not clear what constitutes the "first means" in the elected Figs. 1-5 embodiment. In claim 1, line 6, "in said case" should read –on said case—. In claim 2, line 2, it is not clear in what sense the button 87 in fig. 14 is planar. In claim 3, line 2, there is no antecedent basis for "said docking buttons". In claim 3, line 2, it is not clear in what sense the buttons are planar. In claim 8, it is not clear what constitutes the "side loop". Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lautin (937) in view of Ros (951).

Lautin teaches an elongated, generally flat case 12, a docking port 16, 24, first means 27, 60 for attaching the case to a carrying element 52, a tag 14, second means 34 for attaching the tag to keys 40, a docking button 32 for snap fitting in the port, the docking

Art Unit: 3673

button and docking port being mutually planar, a single docking port 16, 24 in figure 1 and plural buttons and docking ports in fig. 4, means 27, 60 for attaching more than one case together in end-to-end fashion, a side loop (34 for cases 12b, 12c in fig. 4), and a spring arm (the topmost portion of button 32 in fig. 10). Ros teaches a second means 9, 10 including a small hole to receive a circular locking rings for holding keys. It would have been obvious to modify the second means 34 of Lautin to include a small hole to receive a circular locking ring, in view of the teaching of Ros, since either well known second means would function just as well in holding keys.

Claims 1, 6-8, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isenmann (934) in view of Ros (951).

Isenmann teaches a flat, elongated case 10, first means (the top chain in fig. 1) which enables the case to be attached to a carrying element, a docking port 42 within the case, a tag 12 having second means (the bottom chain in fig. 1) for attaching to keys, a docking button 40, 50 for lockable engagement in the docking port of the case, a spring arm 36, the button snap-fitting within the docking port, a side loop 30 allows for holding other keys, and the top chain also allows for attaching more than one case together. Ros teaches a second means 9, 10 including a small hole to receive a circular locking ring. It would have been obvious to substitute a circular locking ring for the locking chain of Isenmann, in view of the teaching of Ros, since either well known type of holder for keys would function just as well.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isenmann in view of Ros as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bienz (498).

Art Unit: 3673

Bienz teaches a single docking port 8 and button 6. It would have been obvious to use a single docking button and port with the key holder of Isenmann, in view of the teaching of Bienz, the motivation being to simplify release of the key holding parts.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 6-8, 12 and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response the remarks on page 14, the fifth and sixth full paragraphs, it is not clear from applicant's remarks why the combination of the Isenmann and Ros references does not teach the claimed subject matter.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Application/Control Number: 10/627,527 Page 5

Art Unit: 3673

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lloyd A. Gall whose telephone number is 571-272-7056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Engle can be reached on 571-272-6660. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lloyd A. Gall/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3673

/L. A. G./ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3673 January 30, 2008